

ings among parties, as evidences that we must sooner or later divide the confederacy. I assured them the measure of *Disunion* was fast finding favor with us at the North, and that very few were aware how numerous were its advocates, at least secretly, even now.—The conscience of every Southern I met told him this was right—that we ought not to be in union with him, while he was a tyrant, and holding us as the life-guard of himself and his wicked associates—and I saw them torn pale. I never was more respectfully treated than by slaveholders, even while speaking my sentiments in the fullest manner. I wish our northern clergymen had half their civility.

Let us urge our doctrine of Dissolution of the Union. Conscience, throughout the Universe, is with us. We are commanding the respect of every slaveholder in the land. I may speak to you further on this subject next week.

Truly yours,

PARKER PILLSBURY.  
Middletown, N. H., 21st Aug., '46.

#### Liberty Party.

FRIENDS OF THE SLAVE—I have for some weeks had some thoughts pressing upon me for utterance. I know not that I can clothe them with words which will enable others to see the importance which I feel in them, but I will try. I am fully persuaded that the citizen of a free state, (as we have been taught to call ours) who takes an oath recognizing in any way the support of any portion of a slaveholding Constitution or Government, is more responsible for the sins practiced by others under that Constitution, than the man who actually owns his fellow man under the same law. The Northern man is moved to the set either by hatred of his brother man, and thus lends his aid to oppress and enslave him, or by a blind devotion to pro-slavery Constitutions and fixtures which are of human origin, stronger than his love of the great laws of justice and equality, established by the Lord of all the earth, whilst the southern owner has the temptation of blind interest as an excuse. I know well that the doctrine of "No union" in slaveholding is the only doctrine for me to preach. I long to see the time when the citizens of the Northern states will "Let the oppressed go free" in the South. I want to see every grade of Anti-Slavery folks moving up to the Disunion platform, yet to denounce the "Liberty party" as being more pro-slavery than either of the others, and thus strive to drive them rashly, or suddenly onto the Disunion ground. I have ever thought had an injurious tendency; for though it may appear clearly true, to some, it will look like a false charge to others, and many, if not most of the members of the Liberty party, will internally feel that the charge is not applicable to themselves. I have not forgotten how I felt when I was a third party voter, and used to read such charges in the Eastern papers, made by the most zealous friends of the slave; and remembering those feelings of my own, enables me to have compassion upon those of my brethren who yet remain in the party. The Apostle Paul when trying to do the best he could, for the time being, toward instructing those who differed much in the things upon which they mainly depended, said: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." (Romans 4th, chap. 2, 5th v.) And it may, in some degree, be the case now "to him that worketh not" for the dissolution of the pro-slavery union, "but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly" compact, "his faith," for aught I know, may be "counted for righteousness." There are many Anti-Slavery "babes" in the Liberty party who need a milder diet than to be told square off that they are more pro-slavery than slaveholding Whigs, and man-selling Democrats. Such severe charges rather repulse and drive away, I think, and should seldom, if ever, be made of the mass of the Liberty friends.

The doctrine of the American Anti-Slavery Society has always been to correct public sentiment, by moral action, holding, that when public sentiment was brought right, the laws would soon come right. Anti-Slavery people in the West generally assented to those positions, yet did not expect the laws to come right, without human agency; they have supposed the formation of a political party to be the means attendant upon this moral action, which had convinced so many of them of the necessity of having all disgraceful laws removed from the statute books. They look upon political action as the inevitable effect, and result, of moral action, and therefore deem it right. I speak from former experience, in common with others, who formed the Liberty party in the West. I know I was once honest in supposing the Liberty party right, and essentially necessary; and I have no doubt but there are hundreds of minds now engaged in trying to sustain the party, from the purest and most benevolent feelings towards the slave, and hence I plead for lenity toward them. I know that denouncing the party never helped me to see the errors of it, but rather retarded and got up a kind of tenacity in me to cling to it rather than otherwise. When calm, clear argument, and persuasive appeals to a better judgment came, then followed conviction, and conviction, so strong that I had to leave the party; yet it pains me to leave my old comrades in party politics, charged with being pirates,

and slaveholders, and perjured villains, especially when it is done by the young, and the inexperienced, who, being convinced of the truth of our Disunion position, themselves, bring harsh and hasty denunciations against all who are yet unconvinced. I have heard several new beginners in the lecturing field, (as I thought,) knock our cause further into the shade than it was before the speech was made, and I have invariably given such a kind of "Eldering," as the Quaker folks say, when they are training a young preacher. I do think there is some danger of Disunionists, and Liberty party folks, becoming arrayed so much in hostile feelings, as to watch over each other for evil, and noticing only the evil they find, they eventually think, that nothing but evil exists.

I write this kind of an article for the good of our cause. I want all the honest and tender hearts in the land to come into the Disunion views, and hence I don't want them offended before they are reasoned with. And it had appeared to me, that so many of us had lit down upon the Liberty party, so nearly at once, that these cautions would be of use.

I must add a word in behalf of Samuel Lewis. I think the address he gave in this place, on the 7th inst., has rarely been equaled by any addresses ever given in this place, for its effect on the minds of the audience in a moral point of view. I will give some short extracts which I noted down at the time; the first sentiment which struck my mind with force, was the following:—"There never was a greater humbug invented, since the devil began to invent humbogs, than for any party to try to make you and I believe that our prosperity depended in any degree upon the government conferring privileges upon us. All that we ask is that the government will get out of our way." &c. And again after he had alluded to the civil practice of debarring colored children from our common schools, and inquired which the people would of choice have among them, an intelligent and enlightened, or an ignorant and degraded colored population, he burst forth in a peal of eloquence in these words:—"The fact is, they are here, and you can't get them away. I don't care if you pass laws against their staying, until those laws are piled as high as the tops of yonder trees, you can't enforce such laws, against the sentiments of the people." &c. Alluding to the intentions of the Liberty party, he said, "We will not only repeal the black laws; and make laws for the equal protection of all persons residing in the state; but we will pass a law making it a highly penal offence for any citizen, officer, or person, to assist in reclaiming a fugitive slave. We will pass a law granting the right of habeas corpus, and jury trial, to any person accused of being a slave. We will appoint judges who will decide that a slave can no more owe service, or labor, than a horse can. Ohio shall be free! There shall not be a foot print of a slave on Ohio soil! Oh you Whigs and Democrats stare, you say we are going a great ways. We are going a great ways, and we are much nearer the end of our journey than you suppose." I have these extracts for friends to make their own comments.

V. NICHOLSON.

MEDINA, Sept. 1st, 1846.

To S. P. Chase, James Moore, E. Harrington, J. P. Cornell, Thomas Heaton, James Pullan, A. Kellogg, T. K. Smith, R. B. Pullan, T. S. Malheux.

GENTLEMEN:—In the paper which you are publishing, viz: the "Democratic Standard and Whig of '76," I discover the following article taken from the Cleveland American:

#### THE DISUNIONISTS IN OHIO.

"The article we quote from the Cincinnati Herald, commencing on the first page of this paper, is worthy of attention, and evidences the necessity of some remarks we intended to make, relative to the purposes and modes operandi of the Disunionists in their present campaign in Ohio. Our Ravenscroft correspondent, week before last, in giving an account of Mr. Lewis' visit at Ravenna, stated that Mr. L. spoke of a letter he had seen, written recently by Foster, in which the latter spoke of their purpose to run a ticket in Ohio, composed of Disunionists, pledged not to accept office.—Brooke, the Gen. Agent of the Old Organizationists, in the *Bugle* undertook to deny the existence of such a purpose, or such a letter, but they are both realities, notwithstanding his disclaimer. We have now before us an extract from the said letter of Foster's, copied from the original, addressed to a clergyman in Portage county. We do not feel free to publish it without the consent of the person to whom it was addressed. It speaks of the purpose of the Disunionists to make Ohio their field of action the present season, and their determination to 'muster all our forces and bring them up to the work.' (Foster's very words.) With as much non-chalance as though they were not continually disclaiming partyism, and prating non-resistance, at all. The reasons given for this new phase of the no-government, non-resistant school, is, that 'This will give us new power over the Liberty party.'—Foster's very words again.

Does master Brooke, or any one else, deny the existence of such a letter? Will Mr. Foster authorize us to call for the publication of any such letter that he may have written?" Your reasons for publishing the above, no doubt, grew out of a wish on your part to supply your readers with some information relative to the movements of the Disunionists in this State; but most unfortunately for yourselves, you have been led by this desire, to retail out which is, as far as my name is used, a sheer fabrication.

I affirm that I never have, either in the *Bugle* or elsewhere, attempted to deny the existence of such a letter as is referred to in the above article, or the existence of the plan pro-

posed by Mr. Foster, which is, to have candidates pledged not to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, if elected, or accept the office.

From my knowledge of several of your number, afforded by a personal acquaintance with you, I am convinced that had you known the low character of that paper for veracity, you would not have published the *ipse dixit* of its editor without some evidence of their truthfulness. I said "unfortunately for yourselves" you have been led to republish a base falsehood, a libelous attack upon my veracity. Such of your number as I have the honor of a personal acquaintance with, I am confident so love the truth, that I am unwilling to believe that you would consider yourselves fortunate in giving countenance to erroneous reports, or currency to falsehoods.

And as to the phrase "no-government, non-resistant school," by which the Disunion movement is designated in the article which you publish, I presume the reasons above mentioned, viz: your regard for truth, would have prevented you from giving currency to it, had you been well informed as to the character of the movement.

Gentlemen, my principles and my unwillingness to do wrong that good may come of it, impel me to a widely different course from the one you advocate. Some of the sentiments published in your paper I have condemned and perhaps I have inadvertently upon them with as much severity as I was capable. Yet, for reasons already given, in addition to the fact that heretofore I have received the most honorable treatment at your hands, I feel the utmost confidence in your disposition to embrace the first opportunity afforded, to inform your readers that L. L. Rice's attack upon my veracity, in the article you re-published, was entirely groundless, and without the shadow of any evidence to sustain him in it.

To give you some idea of the estimation in which the Cleveland American is held by some of the members of the Liberty party, I may be allowed to state that Levi, Milton, and Calvin Sutcliffe attended the meeting held at Mecca, in Trumbull co., on the 8th and 9th of August, and discussed the points of difference between the Old Organizationists and the Liberty party, with all the fairness and candor and honorable bearing by which that family of brothers is characterized, and referring to the remark that the Liberty party was responsible for the course and character of the Cleveland American, Milton Sutcliffe said, "If I supposed the Liberty party understood the character of that paper, and continued to support it, I would abandon the party."

Respectfully,  
SAML. BROOKE.

P. S. I address you through the columns of the *Bugle*, so that each of you may have a copy of my letter, and that no one of you can avoid the responsibility of making the correction.

#### Let no one Blame Them.

EDITORS OF THE BUGLE:—

I became a subscriber to your paper for three reasons. First—because I am willing to examine every thing developed or pertaining to the monster American Slavery, also the measures proposed by those hostile to the system for its overthrow. Second—because I am a believer in the right of opinion, and speech, decidedly so—and I would much sooner stand by those who differ with me, than even countenance their persecution, or defamation, through those who may coincide with myself upon the particular topics in dispute. And third—because I felt willing to forego the little (in my opinion) error the advocates of Disunion inculcate, for the sake of the good, the great amount of truth they advance, may do, in awakening the people of the north to a sense of their condition. It is certainly a matter of regret that such a diversity of opinion and rapacity of feeling exists among the advocates of anti-slavery.—This rancor, or enmity of feeling, no doubt grows out of any thing—but commiseration for the slave.

Antislavery men and women are not infallible, not always right in their feelings, and do not always pursue a course best calculated to secure the object desired. It is human nature to err. And besides man is not always willing to act straight, if he sees straight.—Many times the very object he wishes to secure, perhaps above all others, suffers most egregiously, through his pursuing some wayward or sinister course. And it would certainly be very singular if the advocates of immediate, unconditional abolition of slavery should all pursue a just, and irreprehensible course of action, more than any other class, unless we attach correctness of views, and consequent correctness of action on their part upon the very idea of their just, and liberal views touching this subject. Selfishness, the great bane of society, is accustomed to planning herself in the way of reformers, and they frequently yield to her importunities, not knowing what they do. And it is also in man many times, after having assumed a position to stand upon it, right or wrong, and elude down every thing, if possible, that seems to war with him. In view of these considerations we are not disposed to scold Disunionists, as "of all men most miserable," because they differ with us in our Liberty party views—and many many times, as we believe they do, heap unwarranted censure upon the Liberty party. They have assumed

the Disunion platform, and human nature sticks out as visible in them as others, and as a matter of course, they stand ready to assail every one, who differs with them in their peculiar predilections. And in as much as the Liberty party is at present the most formidable hindrance, to the spread of their principles it is no marvel, that they pounce upon it tiger-like. If the principles of Dissolution, or the Dissolution party (for we call them, the advocates of Dissolution, a party as well as any other organized association) ever triumph it must be over the ashes of the Liberty party. As the latter ebbs, the former flows. This, the advocate of Dissolution, very well know, and if they discharge the greatest number of their artillery upon the Liberty party, who is disposed to blame them? It is human nature. They are not going to give up their work and enter another under any consideration. And for this we do not see how they should be held culpable for any thing very bad—while the whole community are following the same track, under different banners. And so desperately hostile have those persons become to every thing that does not chime with their cantata, that we opine, they cannot many times, see right, if ever so desirous of doing so. In this, we certainly ought not to blame them, for it is human to run to extremes. Mankind many times under a perseverance that stops at nothing in the way of the promulgation of their peculiar tenets, drive themselves into a position where they no doubt honestly think they are right and every one else wrong. And where mankind are honest in the vindication of certain principles, we certainly ought not to blame, and much less vilify them. While S. S. Foster asserts that "the influence of the Liberty party is more detrimental to the interests of the slave, than any other," we are not inclined to heap squibs of defamation upon him. If he so thinks, let him declare it.—And if he can convince the community that this is the case, let him do it. But we do not believe he can. In our opinion, the feelings of some of the advocates of Disunion are strained to such a tension, in favor of their peculiar views and consequent aversion to all others, that it has become a sort of second nature to them, to give every opponent a "rough grab." Samuel Brooke, for instance. We know him of old. A rare specimen is he of whole-heartedness in every thing he undertakes. How is it with him? On the morning he left me to attend a meeting at Atwater conducted by Abby, Foster, Stebbins & co., as his wagon commenced rolling from the gate, he turned himself and said, "now look out and not be brought over, be careful and not be led astray by them," when lo! at the same meeting, five or six hours afterwards, we heard Abby thank God, that Samuel Brooke, had that day cut loose from the Liberty party—and entered the Disunion fold.—Now Samuel's transition was attended with considerable dispatch, and as a matter of course he must at once commence a desperate effort of giving a reason for the hope within him—and Liberty party has been his theme ever since, upon this party he has since continued to heap constant invective, and, withal, what is a little singular, has turned to hating the Liberty party over his own back.

He complains bitterly of the effort which he says has been made by the leaders of the Liberty party to build up their party on the destruction of the State society. We do not look upon it in this light. But we recollect well of hearing Samuel say that at a meeting held in Austinburg by himself, H. L. Preston & co., (then agents for the state society,) that he "with others so arranged the matter as to convert the meeting into a political, or rather, Liberty one, and they did it upright." Now who is disposed to tirade Samuel? He is peculiarly fond of "doing it up right," and if he cannot succeed in one way he will if possible in another; for he is a terrible fellow to draw wherever he hitches—and if he draws well in the harness he has just taken upon him, he must necessarily take a number of hitches upon the Liberty party, or of course he will soon be regarded as unfit for the collar. However we are not inclined to berate Samuel much, for as a man he is affable and obliging—possessing an uncommon degree of perseverance and courage, together with a good portion of denunciation, and under the influence of the latter of these he no doubt thus deals a blow or two upon himself for the sake of its effect upon the Liberty party. We have a few ideas more we would like to write, but we have already occupied more space than we intended.

Yours in battling for the slave.

H. W. CURTISS.

To B. S. & J. E. JONES.

Charleston, Sept. 24, 1846.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—

A communication in the *Bugle* of the 4th inst., over the signature of "A Member," informs the public that I, in publishing my Protest, acted inconsistently and without moral rectitude. This is a high charge, and seems to demand a reply at my hands. Therefore with much reluctance I again appear before that tribunal in self-defense.

The writer of that article labors under some great mistakes, and it will be my province to correct them. She says "I marvel at its appearance in the *Bugle*." This is passing strange; for when the vote was taken in favor of subscribing for the "True American," I immediately announced my intention of leaving the Society: this was objected to by some of the members. I then said if I remained with them I should enter my Protest and publish it in the *Bugle*—which expression elicited some remarks from members present. I would here remark that nothing, but a sense of duty would induce me to abandon a Society whose prosperity is so near my best feelings, and for whose members I cherish the warmest friendship (notwithstanding this little "flare up").

Next I am charged with making a motion for the Society to take one copy of the "New York Tribune." To this accusation I answer emphatically, I did no such thing: (I had not learned that it was the business of a presiding officer to make a motion in an organized body,) but I did propose subscribing for the "New York Tribune," or the "Baltimore Saturday Visitor," in lieu of the "True American;" either of which I considered preferable to C. M. Clay's paper. They are also regarded as reformatory, and their editors, I believe, would seem to leave their editorial chairs, and march to Mexico, for the purpose of fighting slavery's battles. It was well understood at the time, that this proposition was made to satisfy those members who were so desirous to take Clay's paper, and not on my own account at all.

I am grieved that "A member" should evince so much excitement, and such a desire to convict me of dishonesty, and at the same time conceal her own name. I always suspect foul play in such cases.

I presume the readers of the *Bugle* will duly appreciate the quotation from Byron. I will also inform "A member" that I shall not notice any further production over that signature.

Next I am charged with making a motion for the Society to take one copy of the "New York Tribune." To this accusation I answer emphatically, I did no such thing: (I had not learned that it was the business of a presiding officer to make a motion in an organized body,) but I did propose subscribing for the "New York Tribune," or the "Baltimore Saturday Visitor," in lieu of the "True American;" either of which I considered preferable to C. M. Clay's paper. They are also regarded as reformatory, and their editors, I believe, would seem to leave their editorial chairs, and march to Mexico, for the purpose of fighting slavery's battles. It was well understood at the time, that this proposition was made to satisfy those members who were so desirous to take Clay's paper, and not on my own account at all.

I am grieved that "A member" should evince so much excitement, and such a desire to convict me of dishonesty, and at the same time conceal her own name. I always suspect foul play in such cases.

I presume the readers of the *Bugle* will duly appreciate the quotation from Byron. I will also inform "A member" that I shall not notice any further production over that signature.

LYDIA IRISH.  
New Lisbon, 7th of 9th mo., '46.

#### Meeting at Chester X Roads.

EDITORS OF THE BUGLE:—

FRIENDS:—Mr. and Mrs. Foster have been in Chester, a place as notorious for cowardly servility as the Demon of Slavery would desire. At the centre of the town is a Presbyterian, Calvinistic Baptist, Free Will Baptist, and Methodist Meeting House, each within a stone's throw of the other. Each of the societies occupying them is united and harmonious in its own affairs; and between them all there exists what they would call, "a pleasing degree of union." This union was cemented last winter by a "revival" which took place under the auspices of Elder Weaver's preaching, and in which the above named societies, except the Methodist, united. Since that time they have kept up a weekly union prayer meeting. The revivals, as reported, resulted in the conversion of fifty. But what is the effect of all this religious effort, "these means of grace," in impressing the great principles of Christianity, love to God and love to man, upon the people of Chester? Let the following deplorable facts answer.

I came to Chester last Spring. Soon after my arrival, I attended one of the "union prayer-meetings." It was a monthly concert of prayer for the conversion of the world. A variety of missionary intelligence was presented—vehement prayers were offered for the conversion of the miserable heathen—very deep interest in the missionary cause was expressed. Deep feeling and strong sensation were the result. But in behalf of whom was all this expenditure of sympathy? What was the world in the view of this meeting? Not in behalf of American heathen. Our own land did not strike their vision.

A young man saw the manifest absurdity; and under the figure of a father leaving his dying son to perish alone, while he, (the father) should very benevolently employ himself in relieving his afflicted neighbors, he showed up their doings in such bold contrast with the duties which Christianity imposes, as to tell upon the excitement. The scene was well calculated to remind one of the effect produced by dashing cold water upon a blazing forge. A flush covered the face of the minister—the burning zeal was quenched—and the spirit of the meeting died.

After this I attended one of these meetings, and read an item of missionary intelligence. It was the late letter of the Baptist missionary among the Karens. I followed with such remarks as the letter and facts connected with it warranted. The meeting was completely non-plussed. As they listened to their own condemnation at the hands of one they themselves had endorsed as a missionary, their great uneasiness testified that it was impossible to hide the guilt in which they were involved. That evening there was enough to do to keep the meeting in continuance, let alone getting up an excitement.

Such is the religion of Chester. Such is the effect of the revival. And such being the case, of course none of the public houses would be open for those faithful preachers of the truth, S. S. and A. K. Foster.

The Presbyterians, when considering the application I had made for their house, indulged in such slanderous remarks against Mr. and Mrs. Foster, that one of their Deacons remonstrated against it on the ground that they were desecrating the Sabbath. One remarked that they had had something of come-outism before, and that they wanted no more of it. Reference was had, in this remark, to my reading the letter, above referred to. So I suppose we may look out for

a withdrawal of the hand of fellowship from their Karen missionary.

The houses being closed we were under the necessity of preparing a place for the meeting in a grove. The Seminary here is under the entire control of the P. W. Baptists. Connected with it, is a farm on which stands a beautiful grove. Can it be possible that a people possessing so much anti-slavery feeling, and so much liberty of sentiment, as is laid claim to by F. W. Baptists, would lay an interdict upon the woods as well as houses? That they would not even allow free spirits to commune together, and breathe their sentiments, in the green shade? Let the sequel answer. I applied to Mr. Johnston for the grove—the man who, by the direction of the proper authorities, has the supervision of the farm. He granted the use of it; and we began immediately to make preparations for the meeting. No sooner were these facts known than a storm began to gather which so affected Mr. Johnston that he requested me to move our fixtures to some other place. This request came in such a shape as to leave no doubt, that to have used the grove, would have caused serious difficulties. It was on this account that we were urged to leave it.

I leave these naked facts, for the present at least, to the candid consideration of the public—only remarking that there are those whose spirits will not be fettered. Every attempt that may be made to enlist the powers of science in 'oppression's hateful service,' will fail to chain them.

Such were the auspices under which Mr. and Mrs. Foster came to Chester. The meeting on Friday afternoon was small.—But I apprehend that those present will not soon forget it. Mr. Foster placed the cowardly stand taken by the clergy in its true light. Mrs. Foster followed with a speech of deep interest, relating to the early history of the anti-slavery movement. It was well calculated to prepare the way for future meetings. On Saturday the meeting was well attended—on Sunday was large. But I have not room to particularize. Fundamental truths, first principles, and their bearing upon the great sin of the nation, were most clearly and convincingly presented, and enforced upon the conscience with an irresistible power. Even Chester has been reached, and to say that an impression has been made which it will be impossible to obliterate, is but to acknowledge an effort that Mr. & Mrs. Foster have the power of producing, no matter how obdurate may be the materials on which they may be called to operate.

For the cause,  
H. W. CURTISS.  
Chester, Aug. 20, 1846.

#### Let us be Charitable.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—Your paper, No. 51, containing an address by Samuel Brooke, has just fallen into my hands. It seems the writer intends a series of numbers. The first only being before me, I would respectfully ask a small space in your columns to take some brief notice of that article.

In general, it may be said all Liberty men are Abolitionists, but all Abolitionists are not Liberty men. Seeing that as Abolitionists, we are all brethren, let us not fall out by the way—when there is an apparent difference, let us reason together.

I am not aware of any departure by Liberty men from first principles of Abolitionism. In the Declaration of Sentiment set forth at the foundation of the Am. A. S. Society, 1823, we find these words: "We also maintain that there are at the present time the highest obligations resting upon the people of the free states, to remove slavery by moral and political action."

Political action then was among the first means for removing slavery, and it is only carrying out moral principle, for nothing morally wrong can be politically right; all our political action should be based upon moral principle. It is a great error to lay aside Divine law through notions of human expediency. Bible principles cannot be wrong. We not alarmed at the mention of bible politics.—There was a time when it was a duty to "provide out of all the people men such as fear God, men of truth, having clearness, and place such over them to be rulers." The God of Israel said, "The Rock of Israel spoke to me. He that ruleth over man must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Duty is still the same, for we see the bible truth daily verified, that "The wicked walk on every side when the vilest men are exalted." Hence the care of Liberty men to have none but good moral characters nominated for office. These were the views of Liberty Abolitionists when friend Brooke belonged to the party, and if he seceded on account of the sayings or doings of individuals, it was not just to himself, for sometimes individuals of the purest churches so act as to call for the exercise of discipline, but this is not a sufficient reason for secession.

But to be a little more particular, friend Brooke, in his first paragraph, speaking of the Liberty party, says "a party which has proved itself to be an enemy to all Anti-Slavery movements that do not subserve its party purposes." Does the writer mean that we have dropped our Anti-Slavery principles? If so, is it not strange that the other parties still reproach us with our one idea? It is true this one idea is so large as to include the evils resulting from slavery to all classes,